



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO.                     |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 10/817,650   | 04/02/2004  | Cheol Kim            | 70591.86468-001     | 3406                                 |
| 7590   | 07/19/2006  |                      |                     | EXAMINER<br>MOSSER, KATHLEEN MICHELE |
| Warner Norcross & Judd LLP<br>Intellectual Property Practice Group<br>900 Fifth Third Center<br>111 Lyon Street, N.W.<br>Grand Rapids, MI 49503-2487 |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>3715    | PAPER NUMBER                         |

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |                        |                     |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Advisory Action<br/>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|   | 10/817,650             | KIM, CHEOL          |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|   | Kathleen Mosser        | 3715                |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06/30/06 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
  - a)  The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
  - b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
  - (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.


#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
 Kathleen Mosser  
 Primary Examiner  
 Art Unit: 3715

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment adds the features to independent claims 6 and 10, which have not been previously considered during the prosecution of this application. Specifically in claim 6, the amendment adds that the DSP/CPU controls the display to display the caption data corresponding with the digital audio data being output. This specific correlation between the output audio data and caption data has not been previously recited in combination with the other claim elements. Independent claim 10 has been amended to incorporate a plurality of steps not previously claimed. These features each require further search and consideration .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Stevens fails to disclose receiving anything through a wireless communication network. In support of this assertion applicant states that the wireless communication networks communicate over long ranges by employing a network of wireless terminals distributed over a wide area and compares them to a cellular communication network. There is nothing in the pending claim language which states that the wireless network must be a long range network and not supporting evidence for the definition proposed by applicant. A wireless communication network is simply any network that transmits information without using wired lines. These systems include infrared communication and the cordless transceivers of the Stevens invention. Applicant secondly argues that Stevens fails to teach a memory for storing the caption language learning data. This limitation recites the intended use of the memory component. An apparatus claim must be structural distinguishable from the prior art inventions. See MPEP 2114. All other arguments presented are directed to and rely upon the newly added features of the claims for support. As the amendments incorporating these features are not entered, the arguments directed to such are considered moot, and will not be further addressed.